

Dear Howard,

7/31/72 (3)

Begin by considering that my taking the time for this isn't an ego indulgence and remember that you do not take offense at your professors when they illustrate a point they are trying or have tried to make. And understand that as of this moment, what I'll go into remains premature. So, this is a kind of lecture intended neither to give offense nor to be self-justification. Its purpose is to open your mind to what is foreign to you and is almost without exception not tolerated by the "critical" community, some of my more forceful letters. As a philosophic base, recall that you recently read Ecclesiastes at my encouragement, so you know about a time and a place, huh?

You are also familiar with my Washington Post file, so you know that their major 5/31/66 play on assassination work, if a doublecross of me, is the direct result of my effort there and that this effort, even with the intercession of a member of the House Judiciary Committee, after at least a year had come to naught. The change was when I changed the character of my letters and was close to offensive with Friendly. The Post fed the LATimes, which did a similar story, but having no consciences to assuage, the LATimes made no mention of me at all.

That was a major break of its day, one of our more important ones, and the direct immediate cause was what I am sure everyone would regard as an intemperate outburst from me.

You know the Post's attitude, the news it won't report, etc. Now I'll skip other such cases, and success with the government is rather conspicuous, as you should recall, and again never followed sweetness and light from me, to the interruption earlier. It was again from the Post. Again, what you and most would regard as intemperance in a letter to Sen Bradlee, after one of their nutty pseudo-scientific repetitions of the lone-nut bocey. I enclosed a carbon of a piece I had written for the National Enquirer on prospects, using the "Can Mr. Weisberg Translate" threat as a peg to hang the concept on.

It took a while to filter down, from the in basket on Bradlee's desk, but that carbon finally reached the editor of their Sunday magazine, Potomac, that gets over 500,000 immediate circulation and in number and audience is a bit more influential than, say, the Texas b-server. (Ronnie Dugger, by the way, was near here for a year, ranting the home of a friend about 20 minutes away.)

Potomac's editor gave it to his managing editor, who called me a while back. I thereafter saw him once to give him the answer to a question he had asked. Out of the blue today he phoned and we talked for more than a hour. He is going to call back and he is then to come up. I have been rather open with him, electing to trust him, but stipulating that I not be used as either a fool or a tin-plate hero. He has agreed and I expect him to be honest. As of now, I don't know the form whatever they'll do will take, nor do I know if it will come to pass, given the policy control over newspaper content today. But I'll take the time and the chance, and perhaps we'll not all appear to be frustrated nuts.

My point lies in Ecclesiastes: there is a time and a place for everything, not only a time to be born and a time to die, a time to sow and a time to reap the which has been sown. There is also a time for anger, a time for indignation, and a time when it is unmanly not to be. If I may well be guilty of overindulgence on this, and I surely recognize the possibility if not the probability, I encourage you to learn that it is NOT that there is NEVER a time for the kind of thing I do and to which I ~~can~~ can attribute some of the major discoveries. Have an open mind. Don't be the creature of modern education and its stereotypes. In the most recent past, consider that with all the refusals to even accept responsibility for my foundations file and a blind insistence that there was none and it would not be returned, a rather pointed letter to which in today's mail you take exception seems to have gotten at least the promise of its prompt return.

Don't accept blindly. But don't reject blindly, either. As Al Smith said, look at the record. Those old boys said it like it is in Ecclesiastes.

Best, HW